



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/589,656

08/16/2006

Jan D. Boness

N89296

9985

1333 7590 12/29/2009
EASTMAN KODAK COMPANY
PATENT LEGAL STAFF
343 STATE STREET
ROCHESTER, NY 14650-2201

EXAMINER

TZENG, MICHAEL Y

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2625

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

12/29/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/589,656	Applicant(s) BONESS, JAN D.	
	Examiner Michael Tzeng	Art Unit 2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 August 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/21/2006</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Benedict et al. (US Patent No. 5,488,458, hereinafter "Benedict").

In regards to **claim 1**, Benedict discloses method for the detection of marks (1, 1', 1'') by means of a sensor array (10) for a printing machine, characterized in that the marks (1) on a first printing side (5) of a sheet (3) are detected (Col. 2/line 36 discloses the printing of the marks on each side; col. 2 line 40 discloses the sensor of the mark on the first side), that the sheet (3) is turned over and shifted in a direction transverse to the transport direction, and that the marks (1') on a second printing side (6) of the sheet (3) are detected (Col. 2/line 36 discloses the printing of the marks on each side; col. 2 line 44 discloses the sensor of the mark on the second side). However, Benedict does not disclose where the sheet is flipped over and the same sensor is used to scan the second side.

It would have been obvious matter of design choice to combine the sensors into one to scan both sides, since applicant has not disclosed that this difference solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with two sensors.

Claim 4 is rejected under the same grounds as claim 1.

4. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Benedict et al. (US Patent No. 5,488,458, hereinafter "Benedict") in view of Hubble, III et al. (US Patent No. 5,339,150, hereinafter "Hubble").

In regards to **claim 2**, which depends on claim 1, Benedict discloses the marks (1) on the first printing side (5) of the sheet (3) (Col. 2/line 36 discloses the printing of the marks on each side). However, Benedict does not disclose the marks in relation to the marks on the transport belt.

Hubble discloses a mark-detecting system. Col. 2 lines 48-50 discloses the detection of line marks on the transport belt.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Benedict to include the teaching of Hubble. The motivation for this is for better print quality that has been calibrated.

5. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Benedict et al. (US Patent No. 5,488,458, hereinafter "Benedict") and Hubble, III et al. (US Patent

Art Unit: 2625

No. 5,339,150, hereinafter "Hubble") in view of Metzler (US Patent Application Publication No. US 2003/0029341 A1).

In regards to **claim 3**, which depends on claim 1 or 2, Benedict and Hubble disclose the marks and the transport belt, but do not disclose aligning the sheet with the transport belt.

Metzler teaches a method of printing calibration that aligns marks and are set in relation to a drum (abstract).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Benedict and Hubble to include the teachings of Metzler. The motivation for this is for better printing alignment and better printing quality.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Tzeng whose telephone number is (571) 270-7173. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:30am-5pm EST with alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Benny Q. Tieu can be reached on (571) 272-7490. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2625

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Benny Q Tieu/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625

/Michael Tzeng/
Examiner, Art Unit 2625